

## **Public Comment Collaboration on EC-13 – May 6, 2010**

The purpose of this document is to recap the status of EC-13 submitted by DOE with the intent of substantially reducing energy consumption in residential buildings.

### **Current 2009 IECC**

Because of the size and extent of EC-13, original code text is not shown.

### **Original Code Change Proposal as Published in the Monograph**

Because of the size and extent of EC-13, the original change proposal is not shown.

### **Results of First Hearing**

Committee vote for approval 9-1 (IECC). There was strong support for the proposal.

### **Suggested Public Comment**

DOE is not currently planning to submit a Public Comment on EC13. The proposal received wide support and a strong vote at the Initial Action hearings.

In the interim DOE has carefully evaluated the anticipated energy impacts of EC13 and other proposals recommended for approval by the code development committee and concludes that the standard-equipment efficiency and high-equipment efficiency options result in substantially equivalent energy savings (a difference of less than 1% in calculated savings relative to the 2006 IECC).

Several other improvements that have been suggested to DOE are considered minor compared to the larger and more consequential changes of EC13 and will be dealt with via public comments on other change proposals (notably EC27). These include, but may not be limited to

- improvement of the language of footnote 'h' to Table 402.1.1,
- corrections to the steel-framing U-factor equivalency table (Table 402.2.5), and
- corrections to mass-wall U-factor equivalency values (Table 402.1.3).

### **Revise the code change to read as follows:**

Language TBD.

### **Public Comment Development**

Although EC-13 was approved as submitted by the committee, DOE is soliciting input on additional changes via Public Comment that might improve the proposal and the resulting code's usefulness to states and other jurisdictions.

**Interested and affected parties are encouraged to provide comments on the above public comment which is proposed as a starting point development of a public comment that could address this issue in the code.**